



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/618,165

07/17/2000

Jae Beom Choi

8733.039.20

8415

30827

7590

12/30/2005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K STREET, NW

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

BOUTSIKARIS, LEONIDAS


ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/618,165</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>CHOI ET AL. </p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Leo Boutsikaris</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2872</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-23 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/084,583.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: said claim recites "The large scale polarizer", which lacks antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota (US 3,912,920).

Regarding claim 8, Kubota discloses a polarizer structure (Fig. 2) comprising a plurality of sections such as 31 and 32, each section comprising a plurality of transparent substrates 3a made of glass and producing polarized light (Fig. 1, lines 18-29, col. 2, lines 42-51, col. 3). However, Kubota does not disclose explicitly that the transparent substrates 3a causing the polarization of the incident light are made from quartz. Kubota does teach that polarization occurs when light strikes obliquely the plane of a transparent substance such as a glass plate (lines 42-58, col. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2872

invention was made to use quartz plates instead glass plates in the polarizer structure of Kubota, since quartz is similar to glass and it is less susceptible to external deleterious factors. Regarding the limitation that the polarizer structure comprises a holder supporting the plurality of the polarizer sections, it is noted that it is inherent that the device of Kubota shown in Fig. 2 includes a holder to support the polarizer sheet. Furthermore, it is inherent that the polarizer holder includes a light absorptive material, since any material, which is not a perfect reflector absorbs incident light.

Regarding claims 3, 5, 13, 15, the glass polarizer sections are rectangular.

Regarding claims 7, 17, each section 31 comprises a plurality of glass substrates 3a (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 9-10, 20-21, the plurality of the glass substrate parts is placed at a non-zero angle equal to the Brewster's angle relative to the normal line to the surface of the polarizer (lines 43-49, col. 1).

Regarding claims 11, 22, the device of Kubota further includes a light source 1 for generating light, and means 2 for directing light onto the polarizer sheet (Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 4, 14, Kubota does not specify that the sections 31 or 32 are triangular in shape. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the polarizer section triangular, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Here, the result effective variable is the shape of the polarizer. A mesh of triangular shaped sections is more economical to make since it has fewer connecting edges.

Regarding claim 18, the means 2 for directing the light incident on the polarizer collimates the light (see Figs. 1-2, and lines 47-49, col. 2).

Regarding claim 19, the stack of glass substrates 31 partially polarizes the incident light (lines 51-57, col. 2).

Regarding claim 23, the degree of partial polarization depends on the number of glass substrates 3a stacked on top of one another (lines 26-34, col. 3).

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument is that the holder in Kubota's polarizer device does not comprise optically absorptive material, since Kubota teaches that "the principal object is to provide a polarized light illumination device which can utilize...light...without absorbing light", which is allegedly different from the disclosed invention where "[the] polarizer holder 13 includes an optically absorptive material, and preferable includes a material whose optical absorptivity is almost 100%." The examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that a polarizer holder, which is positioned peripherally relative to the polarizing elements 31, 32, is not in the optical path and it does not inhibit the transmission of light through the device. In other words, nothing in Kubota is contradictory to the limitation that the polarizer holder comprises an optically absorptive material.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2872


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Leo Boutsikaris whose telephone number is 571-272-2308.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LEONIDAS BOUTSIKARIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER


Leo Boutsikaris, Ph.D., J.D.
Primary Patent Examiner, AU 2872
December 28, 2005